

From: rnzlessin@yahoo.com
To: Commissioner Adelstein
Date: Fri, Feb 28. 2003 2:32 PM
Subject: Protect Children's Television1

RECEIVED

MAR - 5 2003

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

FCC Commissioner Jonathan S. Adelstein

Dear FCC Commissioner Jonathan S. Adelstein,

The FCC must consider the unique needs *of* children in its upcoming rulemaking on broadcast ownership rules

Children consume almost five and a half hours *of* media per day. Research has shown that media, particularly television, play a unique and powerful role in children's development.

The FCC should consider how further relaxation of media ownership rules would impact children's programming. Deregulation may reduce competition, increase commercialism and result in less original programming for children.

Before making any regulatory changes to existing media ownership rules, the FCC must consider how children will be affected.

Sincerely,

Michael Lessin
733 Cary Drive
San Leandro, California 94577

cc:

Senator Dianne Feinstein
Senator Barbara Boxer
Representative Fortney Stark

From: Vicki Hale
To: Mike Powell
Date: Fri, Feb 28, 2003 5:02 PM
Subject: Preserve Diversity and Openness in the Media and on the Internet

RECEIVED

MAR 5 2003

Vicki Hale
801 Lynn Dr
Lexington, KY 40504

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

February 28, 2003

Federal Communications Commission Chair Michael K. Powell
445 12th St SW
Rm 8-A204
Washington, DC 20554

Chair Powell:

The Federal Communications Commission is responsible for ensuring that the media serve the public interest. I am concerned that the FCC is acting on behalf of big business rather than the people.

It is clear that the FCC has stepped up its efforts to de-regulate the media and telecommunications industries. You must act now to halt further media consolidation and to preserve the openness and diversity of the Internet,

As a supporter of women's rights, I am concerned that the current media merger free-for-all threatens to rob us all of the independent voices, views and ideas that nourish a pluralistic, democratic society. Ownership consolidation is squeezing out what little diversity remains in the marketplace.

The media are more than just a business; they bring information to people that affects their lives. We cannot have a healthy democracy, and women cannot pursue equal rights, if we are uninformed on the issues. The media have a responsibility to serve the public interest and ensure that all voices are heard. It is your job to promote this.

Please remember U.S. consumers and citizens when you review any further regulations. The media giants already control far too much of our precious information resources.

Sincerely,

Vicki Hale

From: Jerry Allen
To: Commissioner Adelstein
Date: Fri. Feb 28, 2003 6:06 PM
Subject: Comments to the Commissioner

RECEIVED

Jerry Allen (jerrallen@earthlink.net) writes:

The relaxation of limits to media ownership would be like another nail in the coffin of our founding fathers' vision of democracy.

MAR - 5 2003
Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

Such capitalism left unbridled would mean the bridling of democracy itself. For once an entity dominates the media outlets in a local market, it's business purpose would dictate that it cut costs for a greater return on investment. The greatest consequence would be the cutting back of funds for news operations because it's far less costly to run a single news source operation than multiple operations.

Competition would suffer, and so would the quality and diversity of the news. So I beseech you to not only vote against the relaxing of ownership rules, but also to vote to roll back said rules to the pre-1996 era. The more ownership, the more diversity. Isn't that what democracy and America are all about.

Respectfully,
W. Jerry Allen, M.A.

Journalism/Mass Communication Research

Server protocol: HTTP/1.0
Remote host: 63.191.0.187
Remote IP address: 63.191.0.187

RECEIVED

From: Roger vanFrank
To: Mike Powell
Date: Fri. Feb 28. 2003 6:42 PM
Subject: Media Ownership Rules

MAR - 5 2003

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

I understand that the Commission ~~is~~ considering relaxing the rules enacted in 1975 regarding the ownership of media properties.

Let me respectfully submit my memory of the reasons, at least locally, here in Utah, for the institution of those rules. At that time, virtually all of the media, Newspapers, Radio and Television were held in the hands of three groups, i.e.: the LDS Church, the Kearns family, and the Hatch family. We, as active and concerned community citizens for a variety of land **use**, historical preservation and ecology issues, found it exceedingly difficult to get any message whatsoever to the general public including frequent denials of paid advertising applications.

To mollify the depressing effects of this virtual censorship, those regulations, now under consideration, were put in place and we found media access immeasurably improved. While it **is** true that the Internet allows such activist citizens and groups to readily communicate between each other, that is known as preaching to the choir. I would suggest that you, as responsible custodians of the public welfare, could best serve our American citizenry, and the principles of free speech, by tightening the rules still further, reducing the number of permitted ownerships, rather than by relaxing them in any fashion.

I think each of you can appreciate that free speech means just that and that a thousand dollars cannot, and should not buy more "Free Speech" than can a hundred dollars. You noticed!!!!???? Dollars cannot be equated with free speech. That is an oxymoron. Find another measurement please.

Roger vanFrank 1445 Michigan Avenue
Salt Lake City, UT 84105 Ph: 801-582-0735

CC: Kathleen Abernathy, Michael Copps, KM KJMWEB, Commissioner Adelstein

From: endure elements
To: Mike Powell
Date: Fri. Feb 28, 2003 8:26 PM
Subject: Media Ownership Rules Opposition

IEC

MAR - 5 2003

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

Michael K. Powell

Chairman

Federal Communications Commission
445 12th Street, SW
Washington, D C. 20554

Dear Mr. Powell,

I am writing to inform you of my strong opposition to the proposed changes from your agency to the Media Ownership Rules. It's not fair that more of our media rights are being taken away. We have the right to see all the media and news without someone deciding what is right. After WW2 restrictions were put on news media outlet ownership because of how totalitarian regimes used controlled media put in the hands of a few corporations and government agencies to control their people and move the world towards war. This isn't right that these few corporations and agencies control what we are allowed to see. This automatically takes away thousands of opinions that move against these corporations because any criticism that is towards these corporations will be filtered and no one will be allowed to see this and it isn't fair to our right to free speech. Agencies are completely ignoring the public's interest in this issue. We believe in a diverse and independent press. You have only held one public hearing on the issue. I do not think you will be able to sneak these proposals past the American Public unseen. Though I definitely have not found out about any of them through your agencies, which just proves of your effort to go unseen from the public eye with these changes. You really should be ashamed that an agency under your power and leadership is not using what is in the interest of the American people, after all this is supposed to be a government based on the people and what is good for the people and this certainly does not define what is good for the people when your taking our rights away.

Sincerely,

Megan Hammond

element-skater361@rnsn.com

10 Fifth Street

Glens Falls NY 12801

USA

February 28,2003

Get more from the Web. FREE MSN Explorer download : <http://explorer.msn.com>

From: Gregory Miller
To: Commissioner Adelstein
Date: Fri, Feb 28, 2003 9:21 PM
Subject: Comments to the Commissioner

RECEIVED

MAR - 5 2003

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

Gregory Miller (gcmiller4@aol.com) writes:

Having those who benefit financially from deregulation testifying on it's behalf is clearly a case of conflict of interest but that pillar of American law apparently means nothing. Without the conglomerate CEO's testifying, you would have had to hold the public meeting in the face of unanimous dissent which would have been uncomfortable because it would have conveyed the impression that you are under seige by an angry public.

Server protocol: HTTP/1.1
Remote host: 205.188.209.76
Remote IP address: 205.188.209.76

From: Michael D .Porter
To: Commissioner Adelstein
Date: Sat, Mar 1, 2003 6:40 AM
Subject: Concerning latest hearings on further media consolidation

RECEIVED

MAR - 5 2003

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

... I strongly object to relaxation of rules allowing further media consolidation. The 1934 Communications Act did not give the interests with the most money the right to control the airwaves and their distribution. It said, specifically, that those airwaves are the property of the people. Implicit in that law was the understanding that those airwaves would be used in the best interests of the people, rather than in the best interests of media conglomerates. Rules made by the FCC in recent years have only furthered the interests and power of media conglomerates, rather than the interests of the people. This is an easily-understood issue by those outside the houses of power in this country

If you were really interested the best interests of the people, you would insist on reinstatement of the fairness doctrine and a return to the precepts of the 1934 act, rather than insisting on rules which will inevitably reduce the people's access to news from that promoted and controlled by six or seven firms to three or four, then two or three, and, eventually, to only one

/s/

--

Michael D .Porter
Roswell, NM (yes, _that_ Roswell)
[mailto:mporter@zianet.com]

Don't let people drive you crazy when you know it's within walking distance.

From: A.N. Mous
To: Mike Powell
Date: Sat, Mar 1, 2003 9:31 AM
Subject: media regulation

RECEIVED

MAR - 5 2003

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

Dear Mr. Chairman:

I have been following with great interest the recent testimony of witnesses in the hearing regarding ownership in the radio industry...and I think I have something to add. To begin with, my note is anonymous because I work at one of the big companies, and there is intense pressure NOT to oppose the company's party line. If it was known that I wrote this, I would be fired.

In short the Telecommunications Act of 1996 is a disaster. It's devastating impact on the music industry has been eloquently addressed. But the problems go so much deeper than that...right to the very heart of the "American Way."

Clear Channel, for example, owns many radio and t.v. news departments. Consolidation has meant that news departments are just that -- consolidated.

Many people were fired...far fewer people have been hired, and those who are hired are often paid less than \$20,000 a year. Ultimately, when the pay went down and jobs disappeared...so did quality talent. What does this mean to America? Everyone gets their news from the same source, news staffs are stretched far too thin and cannot investigate anything, and the people that are willing to work for that kind of money are anything but the best and the brightest. Therefore American voters are not getting what they need to make informed choices...and democracy is dying. People complain that they are getting fluff instead of news...and they are correct. News departments don't have the staff to provide anything else. Consolidation has made a bad situation untenable. Maybe that is good news for seated lawmakers, but it is very bad news for voters.

Even as I write this, I can hear (literally) management chuckling because they say this hearing is a show. They say they know the media conglomerates have lawmakers in their pockets. They snicker that -- in fact -- restrictions are about to be loosened further so they can gobble up more property. Are they correct?

I said earlier in my note that I am anonymous because I do not want to be fired. Why not quit if you don't approve, you ask? There is ultimately nowhere else to go. If you are a radio professional, and you get fired from a biggie that owns almost all of the properties in almost every market, you have committed professional suicide. Is that the "American Way?"

Now listen to some of the stations with proud histories of innovation. and I guarantee you'll find that across the country...no matter where you listen...they sound the same now.

Was that what the F.C.C. was hoping for when *the* Telecommunications Act of 1996 became law?

I hope not.

Most of us on the inside feel this way.

Thank you for your time.

MSN 8 helps eliminate e-mail viruses. Get 2 months FREE*.
<http://join.msn.com/?page=features/virus>

From: A N. Mous
To: Commissioner Adelstein
Date: Sat, Mar 1, 2003 9:35 AM
Subject: media regulation

RECEIVED

MAR - 5 2003

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

Dear Commissioner Adelstein:

I have been following with great interest the recent testimony of witnesses in the hearing regarding ownership in the radio industry...and I think I have something to add. To begin with, my note **is** anonymous because I work at one of the big companies, and there **is** intense pressure NOT to oppose the company's party line. If it was known that I wrote this, I would be fired.

In short, the Telecommunications Act of 1996 is a disaster. It's devastating impact on the music industry has been eloquently addressed. But the problems go so much deeper than that...right to the very heart of the "American Way."

Clear Channel, for example, owns many radio and t.v. news departments. Consolidation has meant that news departments are just that -- consolidated. Many people were fired...far fewer people have been hired, and those who are hired are often paid **less** than \$20,000 a year. Ultimately, when the pay went down and jobs disappeared...so did quality talent. What does this mean to America? Everyone gets their news from the same source, news staffs are stretched far too thin and cannot investigate anything, and the people that are willing to work for that kind of money are anything but the best and the brightest. Therefore American voters are not getting what they need to make informed choices...and democracy is dying. People complain that they are getting fluff instead of news...and they are correct. News departments don't have the staff to provide anything else. Consolidation has made a bad situation untenable. Maybe that **is** good news for seated lawmakers, but it is very bad news for voters.

Even as I write this, I can hear (literally) management chuckling because they say this hearing is a show. They say they know the media conglomerates have lawmakers in their pockets. They snicker that -- in fact -- restrictions are about to be loosened further so they can gobble up more property. Are they correct?

I said earlier in my note that I am anonymous because I **do** not want to be fired. Why not quit if you don't approve, you ask? There is ultimately nowhere else to go. If you are a radio professional. and you get fired from a biggie that owns almost all of the properties in almost every market, you have committed professional suicide. Is that the "American Way?"

Now listen to some of the stations with proud histories of innovation, and I guarantee you'll find that across the country...no matter where you listen ..they sound the same now.

Was that what the F.C.C. was hoping for when the Telecommunications Act of 1996 became law?

I hope not.

Most of **us** on the inside feel this way.

Thank you for your time.

The new MSN 8: smart **spam** protection and 2 months FREE*
<http://join.msn.com/?page=features/junkmail>

From: kristinran@yahoo.com
To: Commissioner Adelstein
Date: Sat, Mar 1, 2003 4:09 PM
Subject: Protect Children's Television1

RECEIVED

MAR - 5 2003

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

FCC Commissioner Jonathan S. Adelstein

Dear FCC Commissioner Jonathan S. Adelstein

The FCC must consider the unique needs of children in its upcoming rulemaking on broadcast ownership rules

Children consume almost five and a half hours of media per day. Research has shown that media, particularly television, play a unique and powerful role in children's development.

The FCC should consider how further relaxation of media ownership rules would impact children's programming. Deregulation may reduce competition, increase commercialism and result in less original programming for children.

Before making any regulatory changes to existing media ownership rules, the FCC must consider how children will be affected.

Sincerely,

Kristin Rankin
3621 W 122nd Place
Alsip, Illinois 60803-1003

cc:
Representative Bobby Rush
Senator Richard Durbin
Senator Peter Fitzgerald

RECEIVED

From: Scott Watkins
To: Mike Powell
Date: Sat, Mar 1, 2003 4:20 PM
Subject: media

MAR - 5 2003

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

if the media is only going to cover what is important to them then there is really no point in doing anything constructive because none of **us** will get any credit for them only the higherarchy of america will be reported. america the equal? fuck america!

From: dsantana@dhs.co.la.ca.us
To: Commissioner Adelstein
Date: Sat, Mar 1, 2003 9:45 PM
Subject: Protect Children's Television!

RECEIVED

MAR - 5 2003

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

FCC Commissioner Jonathan S. Adelstein

Dear FCC Commissioner Jonathan S. Adelstein.

The FCC must consider the unique needs of children in its upcoming rulemaking on broadcast ownership rules

Children consume almost five and a half hours of media per day. Research has shown that media, particularly television, play a unique and powerful role in children's development

The FCC should consider how further relaxation of media ownership rules would impact children's programming. Deregulation may reduce competition, increase commercialism and result in **less** original programming for children.

Before making any regulatory changes to existing media ownership rules, the FCC must consider how children will be affected.

Sincerely

Delia Santana
23610 Enola Ave
Carson, California 90745

cc:
Senator Dianne Feinstein
Senator Barbara Boxer
Representative Juanita Millender-McDonald

From: John Rook
To: Commissioner Adelstein
Date: Sun, Mar 2, 2003 1:59 AM
Subject: Comments to the Commissioner

RECEIVED

MAR - 5 2003

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

John Rook (John@JohnRook.com) writes:

Lotsa comments concerning radio deregulation at www.JohnRook.com

Including this one today that really concerned me.

Rupert Murdoch, an Australian citizen was allowed to own Fox TV and television stations in this country. Republicans in congress, flaunted the laws, pushing through his application for a dual-country citizenship, allowing him to be an Australian-American.

If its possible to bend or break the rules, unpatriotic lawyers will find the way.
My question is this, how long will it be before foreigners are allowed to own radio and TV stations in this country?

Imagine where we will be with radical middle east Islamic owners promoting their causes on US media.

Do you really believe the Mays wouldnt sell out to foreigners for a big profit?
Are we racing toward daddy Bushs One World Government plan? Did
NAFTA, erase our borders and chip away at our sovereignty?

Wake up! Congress isnt listening to the people, money is their god

Server protocol: HTTP/1.0
Remote host: 66.82.9.25
Remote IP address: 66.82.9.25

From: Michael Callahan
To: Commissioner Adelstein
Date: Sun, Mar 2, 2003 4:10 AM
Subject: FCC don't allow media monopolies

RECEIVED

MAR - 5 2003

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

Dear Commissioner:

One of the basic elements which help to keep the American media at least partially free and independent is the set of FCC regulations restricting consolidation and monopolies.

In the 2002 Biennial Review, the FCC appears to be planning to roll back many of these protective regulations: the Newspaper/Broadcast Cross-Ownership Rule, the National Broadcast Ownership Cap, the Local Radio Ownership Rule, the Duopoly Rule and the Dual Network Rule.

Relaxation or abandonment of the preceding rules will result in the purchase of local and independent newspapers and radio and television stations by large media giants. The cost to the American People and Democracy will be far too high if local news, reportorial freedom and access to a true variety of legitimate views are further compromised.

Commissioner, I urge you to make sure the FCC does not relax or drop these vital regulatory rules.

Sincerely

Michael Callahan
San Anselmo, California
94960

DO YOU YAHOO! Get your free @yahoo.com address at
<http://mail.yahoo.com>

From: Robin Melavalin
To: Commissioner Adelstein
Date: Sun, Mar 2, 2003 4:10 AM
Subject: FCC protect media independence

RECEIVED

MAR · 5 2003

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

Dear Commissioner:

One of the basic elements which help to keep the American media at least partially free and independent is the set of FCC regulations restricting consolidation and monopolies.

In the 2002 Biennial Review, the FCC appears to be planning to roll back many of these protective regulations: the Newspaper/Broadcast Cross-Ownership Rule, the National Broadcast Ownership Cap, the Local Radio Ownership Rule, the Duopoly Rule and the Dual Network Rule.

Relaxation or abandonment of the preceding rules will result in the purchase of local and independent newspapers and radio and television stations by large media giants. The cost to the American People and Democracy will be far too high if local news, reportorial freedom and access to a true variety of legitimate views are further compromised.

Commissioner. I urge you to make sure the FCC does not relax or drop these vital regulatory rules.

Sincerely

Robin S Melavalin
West Roxbury, Massachusetts

From: Michael Callahan
To: Mike Powell
Date: Sun, Mar 2, 2003 4:11 AM
Subject: FCC don't allow media monopolies

RECEIVED

MAP · 5 2003

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

Dear Commissioner Powell.

One of the basic elements which help to keep the American media at least partially free and independent is the **set** of FCC regulations restricting consolidation and monopolies.

In the 2002 Biennial Review, the FCC appears to be planning to roll back many of these protective regulations: the Newspaper/Broadcast Cross-Ownership Rule, the National Broadcast Ownership Cap, the Local Radio Ownership Rule, the Duopoly Rule and the Dual Network Rule.

Relaxation or abandonment of the preceding rules will result in the purchase of local and independent newspapers and radio and television stations by large media giants. The cost to the American People and Democracy will be far too high if local news, reportorial freedom and access to a true variety of legitimate views are further compromised.

Commissioner Powell, I urge you to make sure the FCC does not relax or drop these vital regulatory rules.

Sincerely,

Michael Callahan
San Anselmo, California
94960

DO YOU YAHOO! Get your free @yahoo.com address at
<http://mail.yahoo.com>

From: Marla Clayman
To: Commissioner Adelstein
Date: Sun. Mar 2, 2003 8:03 PM
Subject: FCC don't allow media monopolies

RECEIVED

MAR 5 2003

Dear Commissioner

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

One of the basic elements which help to keep the American media at least partially free and independent is the set of FCC regulations restricting consolidation and monopolies.

In the 2002 Biennial Review, the FCC appears to be planning to roll back many of these protective regulations. the Newspaper/Broadcast Cross-Ownership Rule, the National Broadcast Ownership Cap, the Local Radio Ownership Rule, the Duopoly Rule and the Dual Network Rule.

Relaxation or abandonment of the preceding rules will result in the purchase of local and independent newspapers and radio and television stations by large media giants. The cost to the American People and Democracy will be far too high if local news, reportorial freedom and access to a true variety of legitimate views are further compromised.

Commissioner, I urge you to make sure the FCC does not relax or drop these vital regulatory rules.

Sincerely,

Marla L. Clayman

Get Your Private, Free Email at <http://www.hotmail.com>

From: Marla Clayman
To: Mike Powell
Date: Sun. Mar 2, 2003 8:05 PM
Subject: FCC don't allow media monopolies

Dear Commissioner Powell:

One of the basic elements which help to keep the American media at least partially free and independent is the set of FCC regulations restricting consolidation and monopolies,

In the 2002 Biennial Review, the FCC appears to be planning to roll back many of these protective regulations: the **Newspaper/Broadcast** Cross-Ownership Rule, the National Broadcast Ownership Cap, the Local Radio Ownership Rule, the Duopoly Rule and the Dual Network Rule.

Relaxation or abandonment of the preceding rules will result in the purchase of local and independent newspapers and radio and television stations by large media giants. The cost to the American People and Democracy will be far too high if local news, reportorial freedom and access to a true variety of legitimate views are further compromised.

Commissioner Powell, I urge you to make sure the FCC does not relax or drop these vital regulatory rules.

Sincerely,

Marla L. Clayman

Get Your Private, Free Email at <http://www.hotmail.com>